UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DWIGHT D. MURRAY,

Plaintiff,

-V-

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS CORP., ET AL.,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: \_\_\_
DATE FILED: \_2/20/2025

## **ORDER**

24-CV-7546 (RA) (HJR)

## HENRY J. RICARDO, United States Magistrate Judge.

Plaintiff Dwight Murray filed his Complaint on October 4, 2024. ECF No. 1. On February 5, 2025, the Court issued an Order to Show Cause ("OTSC") why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. ECF No. 5. By Letter dated February 14, 2025, Plaintiff responded to the OTSC and informed the Court that he promptly requested that summonses be issued in this case upon receipt of the OTSC. ECF No. 7; see also ECF No. 6 (issuing summonses as to Defendants Todd Schulman, Hans Vestberg, Jason Cegielski, and Verizon Communications Corp.).

Plaintiff is directed to arrange for service of the summons and complaint on each Defendant within 90 days of the issuance of the summonses.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff should file proof of service on the docket once effected. If within those 90 days, service has not been effected upon Defendants or Plaintiff has not requested an extension of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that a summons be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, the summonses in this case were not issued at the time Plaintiff filed the complaint and paid the filing fee. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued.

time to do so, I may recommend that the Court dismiss the claims against

Defendants under Rules 4 and 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure
to prosecute.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se litigant.

## SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 20, 2025 New York, New York

Henry J. Ricard

United States Magistrate Judge